NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

DEVOTED TO THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE AND MISCELLANY OF CHASTE AND MORAL TENDENCY.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. IV. SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1835. NO. 13.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA, AND EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. Price, Publisher and Proprietor.

TERMS—Two dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia. Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(Extract of a Sermon by Rev. H. Colman.)

Do you ask to be allowed to choose your own religion? then allow others to choose theirs.—Would you read and judge of the scriptures for yourself? let others read and judge for themselves. Do you claim to be tolerated and protected in your religion? protect and tolerate others. Would you deem it wrong that others should condemn and persecute you because you differ from them? then do not condemn and persecute others, because they differ from you—Do you in your conceit and arrogance feel that you have a right, because they differ from you, to disdain or calumniate or ill-use them? This is a very serious conclusion; and before you come to it, be careful to determine how much more they differ from you than you from them.

But you say, as many have said, that you know you are right. They are equally sincere and confident on their part; and if mere confidence and sincerity are to determine the correctness of our faith and piety, there are no opinions and professions which may not be established. The Mahometans and Hindoos are as ready to die for their religion as Christians; and Paul was confident that he was right, when he was hurrying on to Damascus with the frenzy of revenge against the disciples, as when, at the peril of his own life, he so eloquently pleaded their cause at the tribunal of the Roman Governor.

But then you tell me you have experienced the influences of the Divine Spirit; you have been converted by a miraculous operation;—you have been visited with light from Heaven; and the darkness of error and ignorance, which overshadowed your mind, has been scattered. It may be so. I do not question the sincerity of your convictions. I would not speak of them with the slightest disrespect. But the Quakers, the Swedenborgians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Calvinists, the Shakers, and even the Mormonites, are as confident as you are, that they also have been the subjects of these divine influences; that light directly from Heaven has been poured upon their minds; and that they also have an unerring teacher within. Now can the operations of the same spirit be so entirely at variance? Can the same fountain send forth at the same time sweet water and bitter; and is not the fact, to which we here refer, in itself the best of all reasons, why you should pause; and regard your own conclusions, however strong, with some distrust; and, above all, not make them the ground of condemnation, or exclusion, or hostility against others.

Again you say there is but one right way.—One right way for what? Do you mean by this, that there is only one way of worship which God will approve; or one particular religious profession or faith by which men can secure his favor, and be happy in another world? Suppose a Quaker should say this; or a Baptist; or a Unitarian, there is no salvation out of their church, or their faith, or their forms. What is the answer to be made to such a man; if indeed a mind so narrow is capable of comprehending any reasonable answer? Here then of the present inhabitants of the world, to say nothing of the countless multitudes, who have already passed off the stage, three fifths never heard of the gospel; of the other two fifths who are nominally christians, more than one half are Roman Catholics or of the Greek Church; of the remaining fifth, although living in a Christian land, not one half seem to have any religion; and of the small remainder, divided into innumerable sects, how very, very, very small a portion are either Quakers, or Baptists, or Unitarians?—Can either of these sects, who are a mere handful, have the presumption and self-conceit to believe that Heaven is designed for them only? Why there is no sect in Christendom so numerous that it would make any considerable figure in the immensity of God's family, or be more than a drop to the ocean. Then too, do they know that God is no respecter of persons? Do they not consider that this earth itself is a mere point in God's universe? Let them look up to the heavens in a clear starlight night. Let them try to count the radiant worlds that hang over them; all filled with rational and intelligent beings, who belong to God's family. Let them remember that what they then behold, all that the eye can take in, is only an atom compared with the illimitable creation. Let them consider that, beyond all doubt, there are many worlds and systems of worlds, whose light though travelling with an inconceivable swiftness, ever since this globe was created, has not yet reached us; and then let them suppose, if they can, that the Almighty Creator, the great Lord and Father of all these worlds, designs to receive to his favor, and to exclude all others, a few blind, ignorant, and conceited Quakers, or Baptists, or Unitarians, who have taken it into their heads, which it would seem were hardly capable of containing any thing else, that they are the particular and exclusive favorites of Heaven! Away with such nonsense! Away! Away! with such narrow, frivolous conceits, which are not worthy even of the understanding of a child.

If a man's faith mends his morals, it is so far valuable; and we should hesitate long before we attempt to disturb it. If a man's religion makes him a good man, it is a good religion for him; and if it makes him a better man than any other religion would make him, let it be right or wrong in mere speculation or form, it is the best religion which he can have. True Christianity is the strictest of all possible rules of life. In its principles, motives, sanctions, spirit, and influence, it is beyond every other favorable to purity; and suited to form the character to the highest possible moral excellence of which it is capable. But how little of it is there in the world; how grossly is it misunderstood and misrepresented; and in how many ways without any ill design is it corrupted and abused. Some Mahometans have been better than some Christians. Now, if converting them to our particular notions or form of Christianity, would only make them worse men, injure their temper and their morals, they had better remain Mahometans.

Some men are very good men, good husbands, kind parents, faithful friends, obliging neighbors, good citizens, industrious, honest, temperate, useful men, until as they term it they "get religion," become converted, and are born again; and then as it happens in some cases, but by no means in all, they forsake their employment; neglect their families; forget the commandment, which says, six days shalt thou labor; think their own religion safe, and go about to take care of their neighbor's religion; call those who do not believe as they do, Heathen; have the presumption to tell in public how religious they have become instead of leaving their works to prove it; and set themselves up to be the teachers of others, when they have need themselves to be taught the first principles of the oracles of truth; and have the impudence to speak with disdain of being honest and temperate and just and frugal and industrious and charitable, and contemptuously pronounce it carnal morality; and with a Pharisaical grimace frown upon all the innocent pleasures of childhood and youth, as though it were a mortal sin even for the lambs in the spring to skip and play; and call all care of one's personal appearance and the simple and modest ornaments of youthful beauty and innocence wicked adornings; as though any thing, which man could do, could rival the gilded covering even of the insect, which buries itself in the ground or the splendors of the shell, which lies at the bottom of the ocean. And then certainly their religion has made them much worse men than they were before; and therefore we think for them it is a poor religion. If on the other hand being converted and born again has the effect to change the character for good, makes the immoral moral, the drunkard sober, the cheat honest, the idle industrious, the wasteful frugal, the proud humble, the man a better father, husband, neighbour and friend; the impious pious, the sabbath breaker the sabbath keeper; and the ferocious and selfish a kind, forgiving, benevolent Christian, loving every body, trying to do all the good in his power, and wishing to see every man as happy as he desires to be himself; then his religion is good, let him call himself by what name or join what church he chooses; for this is true Christianity; this is what religion designs to make men; this is the great test of character, according to the apostle—"Let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous."

Original.

REV. MR. FOOTE.

Towards the close of his sermon on Luke xiii, 24, Mr. F. made the following remarks—"The Universalist gives a very *literal* answer to the question, 'are there few that be saved?' Ask a Universalist preacher this question, and he will tell you that *all* are to be saved; give yourself no uneasiness. Suppose Jesus Christ was now on the earth, and an anxious sinner and a Universalist preacher should go to him and say, 'we have had a dispute, and we wish you to settle it,' what would Christ say?—he would say, 'the wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God.'" This is indeed a summary method of putting down the arguments of an opposer. To put language in the mouth of Christ which has long been perverted from its true meaning, to subserve the cause of a false theology, and which Mr. F. knows full well, exactly accords with the preconceived notions of his hearers. We call upon Mr. F. to show us, on the authority of the Bible, that the word "hell" signifies a place of torment in the future state. This he cannot do; hence he would represent the Saviour, who he believes is the Almighty God himself, as altering his own immutable declarations, and subverting their original meaning, for the sake of accommodating them to the views of prejudiced mortals.

We will suppose with Mr. F. that the blessed teacher is here among us, and we will suppose again that he attends a protracted meeting at Dr. Lansing's church; he there hears Mr. Foote striving hard to prove that but a "*few*" will be saved; "what would Christ say?" He would say; "O mistaken man, you have wrong views of "hell," it does not mean a place of endless wailings and torment about which you are alarming people; far from it; David has gone to hell, (sheol,) 'the region of the dead, the underworld;' all the prophets have gone down to its silent slumbers full of years and in peace. I myself, (continues the Saviour,) 'descended into hell, but my soul was not left there nor did I see corruption.' Besides, there is no danger that any of my Father's children will be endlessly miserable, for I am the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world' John i, 29. My Father 'hath given me power over all flesh that I should give eternal life to as many as he hath given me,' xvii, 3. Again, you are aware that my servant Paul whom I called to preach the truth as it is in me, has left on record the declaration that 'God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.' You are mistaken, child of humanity! in supposing that only *few* will be saved, for hear once more the testimony of my approved servant, 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *many* be made righteous,'" Rom. v, 19. The candid reader must judge which of the two foregoing suppositions is the more probable.

Mr. F. puts the questions "Did Christ say all men are going to heaven? Did he not say that some are *not* going to heaven?" We answer, no; he did not say *either* of these in the text, "Strive to enter" &c', nor in the context, for he was not speaking of things pertaining to the future state at all, as Mr. F. can learn by comparing this chap. with Matt. xxiv, and by consulting some of his approved commentators. He concluded his remarks on the "Universalist" as I should have anticipated: "God says *let them alone*, and oh! beware of planting your feet on these shores of *infidelity*." He did not see fit to tell us how he came by this new revelation, this special command; whether it came in a vision, or by "the evil spirit" that came upon Saul, and "between Abimelich and the men of Shechem;" but we think that two good reasons may be assigned for Mr. F's. remark. 1st, It would not answer the object which he has in view of getting up "an *excitement*," if he should present his hearers with as rational and scriptural views of the character of God as Universalists entertain. 2d. He is conscious that notwithstanding much has recently been said and written against this sentiment, it is rapidly increasing, he therefore concludes that, "God says, let it alone."

We have a word to say with regard to Mr. F's. attempt to associate Universalists, with Infidels. This is quite common with men of Mr. F's. stamp, although, like him, they make the charge, and then are the first to deny it. They aver that "the *infidel* denies the being of God, and scoffs at his revealed word," and then almost in the same breath they assure us that the Universalist tries to make out from the *Bible* that God will save all mankind. We shall see how Mr. F. destroys his own "baseless fabric of a vision and leaves not a wreck behind." He lays it down as a fact that Universalists are infidels, and that "God says let them alone," then as if to hurl defiance at the behest of the Most High, we hear him a few days after this, preaching a *long sermon* against the infidel. If, as Mr. F. declares, "no man can be a christian who does not daily and constantly keep God's commands," we say to him "beware of the shores of infidelity." Why preach against those whom God says, you must let alone?

"The infidel (or Universalist, for they are synonymous with Mr. F.) has no religion; the marks of his character, are profane swearing, sabbath breaking, and dishonesty; he sins with impunity." Be it known to Mr. F. that the Universalist *has* a "religion." It is that which Jesus of Nazareth taught; it comes not, it is true, in the tempest, in the hail-storm, or the fearful earthquake; it is love to God and our neighbor, it is recorded in the volume of Divine truth which we receive as the rule of our faith and practice, and it teaches us to "swear not at all," and that our "communications be yea, yea, and nay, nay." As to the sin of "sabbath-breaking, and sinning with impunity," Mr. F. knows or he ought to know, that Universalists consider it their duty and their priviledge to worship God on the sabbath, and that they have no such unscriptural doctrine in their faith as the one which he names, that "men may sin with impunity, and take *pleasure* therein." He goes on to say, "Infidels deny the Bible, and ask them about their salvation, they will say, that they care nothing about it; they do not know or concern themselves about it." Now by Mr. F.'s own showing, this does not apply to us; for he had previously said, "a Universalist preacher will tell you that *all* are to be saved." Hence the Universalist and infidel are not one and the same.

"The infidel (he says,) breaks his promises, he has the spirit of condemning others, he has a sovereign contempt of good manners, he believes that religion makes us unhappy, he has no feeling, he opposes revivals, and he *drinks rum*, as much as he pleases." If these are the certain "marks of infidelity," alas for the church, we fear that she will be dashed on "these shores." Who "breaks their promises?" Mr. F.'s converts tell you in their prayers that they have even violated those which they made to the Almighty; and "the spirit of condemning others" is not an exotic from infidel "shores." As to a want of good manners, Mr. F. says that "he has known even *young ladies* to leave the room when the subject of religion was mentioned."—We ourselves have also known *gentlemen* professing christians of Mr. F.'s own order, 'to leave the room,' very abruptly too, when they could not carry on a successful opposition against the truth. As to the belief that "religion makes us unhappy," &c. Mr. F. himself says that "a christian need not expect *happiness* here, his reward is *all in Heaven*;" yet he tells us in the same discourse that "he had enjoyed more happiness in one minute, since he became a *christian* than he did in all his former life." But the 'infidel has no feeling, he opposes revivals, and he drinks rum.' Mr. F. is now holding a protracted meeting, and daily "prayer meetings" to arouse the lukewarm, and apparently *dead feelings* of the church. They are destitute of feeling, "*they* must be awakened or there is no hope of a revival." And there are good honest Presbyterians, &c. who "oppose" Mr. F.'s revivals, and who may have used a little "rum" as a medicine. So that Mr. F.'s "sure marks" of infidelity, we have reason to apprehend, sometimes fail. That Universalists are infidels, we repeat it, is a false imputation, and unsupported by known facts. There may be persons denying the doctrine of endless punishment; but this of itself, can no more entitle them to the name of Universalist, than the belief of the Mahometan in his "seven apartments in hell," entitles him to the name of *christian*. We wish that preachers, that laymen, and all our opposing brethren, would learn *what* we believe, and then come to the work of "storming our citadel," with the sword of *truth* and the panoply of candor.

New-York, Jan. 1835. B. B. H.

LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

The public has been apprised of the more immediate and pressing wants of this Institution—it should also be informed of its principles and progress, of what it has done and is now doing. For it cannot be expected, that community will sustain an Institution, of the character, regulations and doings of which, it possesses no proper knowledge.

The "Liberal Institute" received an academical charter at the last session of the Legislature, and in consequence, holds a place among the literary establishments of this State, in which the people have an interest. It is not its patrons alone, therefore, who should be well apprised of its character and prospects.

The Institute is, what its name imports—liberal. Its principles are decidedly and avowedly anti-sectarian, and its Constitution provides, that "students shall not be persuaded by any officer or teacher to attend the religious meetings of any one denomination of Christians, in preference to another." And these principles are carried out in every department of the Institution—in the selection of teachers, and in the unrestrained religious liberty of the students. Liberality, not of sentiment alone, but of practice, is expected in all its members. Teachers must be as liberal as the institution; and a bigot to a party—be that party what it may—cannot be sustained. The present professors and teachers have been employed without any direct reference to their religious opinions, to the forms of their worship, or the place where they may prefer to offer them.

The discipline of the Institute is neither rigid nor inefficient. The students have been encouraged to believe, that they were fully capable of knowing their duty, and of performing it—and consequently, of exempting the teachers from the labor of governing, by governing themselves. And this course has thus far succeeded beyond the hopes of the most sanguine; and with the exception of a few boys, who seemed incapable of being won by kindness—the students have done honor to themselves, and credit to the Institution. Their feelings have never been outraged by the officious dictation of their teachers; and yet we are fully sustained in saying, that an equal number of youth were never congregated in a literary institution, whose morals were better, or who did less violence to the public peace.

It has ever been an object of the first importance in the Institute, to give a substantial education. Little—indeed nothing, has been done for display; and the public examinations have been in the ordinary course of study appertaining to

the respective classes.

Each student is not only permitted, but encouraged to advance as fast as possible—care being always taken that he should be well instructed, as far as he goes. This has sometimes encumbered the teachers with too many classes; but has excited a very praise-worthy emulation among the students. Indeed their industry is scarcely paralleled—eight, ten, or twelve hours being by many students, daily devoted to the labor of study. How far this may have influenced their moral character, we presume not to judge; but it is fair to suppose that good morals are cherished by superior industry.

The Ladies' School attached to the Institute, has now been most successfully conducted for nearly two years; and the course of instruction is fully equal to that in any other similar school in this country. The improvement of the pupils has constantly been such, as to confer the highest praise on their instructress. The principal complaint has been that the pupils were required to do much—and do it well.

As the Institute was founded for the express purpose of rescuing the youth from the grasp of sectarianism, it will be gratifying to its friends, to know, that since its establishment, nearly four hundred youth have enjoyed its privileges, and the benefits of its instructions. The present number is, in both departments, about eighty—a number which would be greatly augmented, were liberal parents and guardians as anxious to protect their respective charges from the pollutions of what they believe erroneous creeds, as they are to save the very trifling expense of sending them abroad for an education. S. R. S.

Magazine and Advocate.

SCRIPTURE DEFINITIONS OF THE WORD HOPE.

This word is from the Saxon, *Hopa*, and signifies

1. The expectation of some future, unseen, good things, Rom. viii, 19, 24: 'For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'

2. Jesus Christ, who is so called, because all we expect of future good comes through him, Acts, xxviii, 20: 'For this cause therefore have I called for you, to see you, and to speak with you; because that for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain.'

3. The things hoped for, Col. i, 5: 'For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel.'

4. The gospel dispensation, Heb. vii, 19: 'For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.'

5. It means all enjoyed by believers in this world, and all promised them in the world to come, Eph. i, 18: 'The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.'

The foundation of hope is the oath and promise of God, Heb. vi, 17, 18: 'Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us.

On this account a believers's hope is said to be in God, 1 Peter, i, 21: 'Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God,'

The hope of a real believer is,

1. Good as he expects such as God has promised, even eternal life, 2 Thess. ii, 16: 'Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill their sins always; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.'

'In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began.'

2. Lively, giving life to all who have it, and making them active in the service of God, 1 Peter, i, 3: 'According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue.'

3. Pure, as it leads to purity in all things, 1 John iii, 3: 'Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'

4. Sure and steadfast, making the mind firm, amidst all the troubles of this life, Heb. vi, 19: 'Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail.'

5. It makes all bold who are in possession of it, Rom. v, 5: 'And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us.'

6. It gives joy to all who have it, Rom. xii, 12: 'Rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer.'

7. It is a gift, being freely bestowed on all who are willing to receive it, 2 Thess. ii, 16: 'Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace.'

8. It is one, or the same in nature in all who are in possession of it, Eph. iv, 4: 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling.'

The hope or expectation of the resurrection of the dead, is the only thing to support in trouble and cause a person to die in peace, Acts, xxiii, 6: 'But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.'

'For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.'

UNIVERSALISM.

It was an old objection to to this doctrine—now somewhat gone out of date, that it was dangerous to the public morals, and exerted a corrupting influence upon mankind. Now one thing we hold to be certain touching this matter, that if Universalism has a bad influence on the heart, it must be in regard to those people who believe it. It would be strange enough if a doctrine should corrupt people who never believed it. If Universalism has the power of corrupting only those persons who believe it, and no power to corrupt those who do not believe it, it becomes a very important inquiry, how are we to account for the wickednesss of those persons who never believed in Universalism? There has been a great deal of wickedness in the world particularly in the professed church of Christ. What dreadful persecutions! What burning of alledged heretics! What cruelties in the Inquisition! What animosities between the different sects! what hatred! what contentions! what bitterness? If the wickedness of Universalists is to be attributed to their doctrine, then, by a parity of reasoning, the wickedness of others should be attributed to their doctrine. If this rule of judging be correct, just compare the amount of evil which has been charged against the doctrine we believe, with the amount of evil which has actually been committed by the believers in endless misery; and you will say there is a fearful disproportion—a disproportion equal to that between one and a hundred. But it may be thrown out of the question altogether, whether the wickedness and sin, (comparatively very great) of those who disbelieve Universalism, are to be be brought against that doctrine? It cannot be so. The precepts of Christ certainly lead us to the practice of virtue. Now there is not a single precept which is not congenial to the doctrine of Universalism. Love God with all the heart—love your neighbor as yourself—do unto others as you would that others should do unto you—as much as in you is, live peaceably with all men—be kindly affectionate one to another &c. &c. How does it happen *that all the precepts of Christ should lead us to practice what is congenial only to so very precious a doctrine?* This is the strangest of all strange things. We want the opponents of Universalism to think of this—those who slander us, and misrepresent our doctrine. When men obey the precepts of Christ, it is indisputable that they live lives of kindness and love; and this is congenial to the doctrine which Universalists believe. How is it possible then, that the precepts of Christ, and the law of God should lead us to practice what is congenial only to a very wicked doctrine?—*Boston Trumpet.*

ATTENDANCE ON PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Not a long time since we copied from the Maine Christian Intelligencer an article on the great danger of exposing ones self to *Sunday storms*, particularly in attending public worship. Br. Drew has favored us with farther important information on the subject, as will be seen in the atricle which follows. He is desirous it should be extensively circulated. We most cheerfully lend our aid in the work.—Reader, look at it; if it touches thy case, take courage.

P.

We have consulted several judicious physicians, on the subject of exposure to the weather and they all, to a man, assure us that cold weather or a storm on Sunday is not any more injurious to the health of people on that day, than upon any other day of the week. We are desirous that this information should have a wide circulation, in the hope that whenever the weather proves cold or stormy on the Sabbath, people may not feel compelled to stay away from church from the fear that by going to meeting, they would catch their death of cold. They already know, that on any *other* day, they may safely brave the storms in the prosecution of business and pleasure; it is time they were made acquainted with the interesting fact, that they may go to meeting in similar weather without any greater danger. Old Dr. Leighton was admonished one Sunday not to proceed to church, as he was unwell and the weather was rainy. If the day was pleasant, said the good old man, I *would* stay at home: but since it is foul, I must and will go, lest by my example I should countenance the irreligious practice of letting trifling hindrances keep me back from public worship. The friends of every religious meeting, ought to adopt the same rule.

CREDIT.

We perceive the "Herald of Truth," at Geneva, has commenced the publication of the Controversy between Dr. Ely and Br. Thomas. We are glad of this, because we wish it to circulate as extensively as possible; but at the same time we think it no more than justice that our brethren of the Herald should give credit regularly to the papers through which it appears.

The latter remark may also apply to the Vermont Watchman. We may be regarded over-nice in this matter, but we cannot help it if we are. We feel that all possible care should be taken here. Errors may occur we know, occasionally, in the hurry of putting papers to press, but repeated ones should be guarded against. In the Watchman of the 10th inst. Br. Thomas' letter is copied without credit, and then on the last page we have—"*From the New-York Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,*" placed over Br. Grosh's "Introductory Address," to the 3d vol. of the Christian Visitant!! Render unto each their right.

P.

Original.

OUR BELIEF---No. 2.

I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things. Isaiah. xlv, 7.

We believe that God is the *Creator of all things*. The Magicians of old, and the Manicheans in latter times, were led to adopt the notion of two *creative* powers, because they were unable to account for the existence of both good and evil, on any other supposition. The former indeed held that two life-giving principles existed from all eternity! This is a strange anomaly in the history of religious faith. I know of no other people who have ever believed that two creative powers of opposite natures have eternally existed. Many, however, have imbibed an opinion that is not less preposterous. The belief that there are more creators than one very extensively prevails throughout the Christian world.—And to imagine that more than one being possesses *creative power* is no greater absurdity than to suppose that two creators have existed from all eternity.

There is a striking similarity between the opinions of most professing Christians of the present day, and those of the Manicheans. It is a common belief among modern professors of Christianity, that the Devil possesses the power of creating that, the existence of which is not only in opposition to the Divine will, but which will effectually hinder the accomplishment of God's original purpose with respect to the final destiny of the intelligent creation. Now the devil either possesses the power of creating evil independently of the Supreme Being, or else the Supreme Being has delegated this power to him. If the former is conceded, then it follows of course, that there are two creative powers in the universe; and that the Manichean hypothesis is correct. If the latter is maintained, then it follows, we think, necessarily, that the Divine purpose cannot be defeated by even the existence of evil. For it would seem quite irrational to suppose that God would grant creative power to a being, who would use that power in successfully thwarting the plans of Almighty Love!

The moment we acknowledge the existence of more than one *Creator*, we yield the *foundation* of the Religion of the Bible. But people cannot understand how both good and evil can exist in the world unless there be two creative powers of opposite natures, from which these two different qualities proceed. Neither could the ancient Persians understand this matter.—But God understood all about it, as may be seen by a reference to the language that heads this article. This language of the Divine Being explains the whole difficulty, and positively assures us that *God is the Creator of all things*.—He "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." He "is God; and there is none else." A. M.

New-London, Ct.

Original.

OWEN ON PSALM CXXX.

In a commendatory notice of Dr. Ebenezer Porter's abridgment of the above work, Dr. E. S. Ely says:—

"This book is published very seasonably at the present time when a multitude of Universalists wholly deny that there is any forgiveness of sin with God; and assert that every sinner receives in this life the full penalty of his transgressions. If God's prisoners to divine justice all serve their time out in the Prison of the Universe, why then, indeed, it would be absurd to talk of their being pardoned, and experiencing a remission of sins for Christ's sake. But we have not so learned the gospel of Christ."

All intelligent Universalists who read the above will know, that Dr. Ely is either ignorant of their real sentiments and renders himself ridiculous by making dogmatical assertions about a subject he does not understand; or that knowing the truth in this case, he stoops to the paltry measure of misrepresentation, to subserve the interests of his sect, or to promote the sale of Dr. Porter's book.

Charity would lead us to suppose that he errs through ignorance, and the same principle would prompt us to make an effort to enlighten his mind. We solemnly assure him, then, that no Universalist will deny, that "there is any forgiveness of sin with God." So far from denying any such thing, we most sincerely believe the truth of the very Psalm upon which Dr. Owen's book is professedly based:—"If thou, LORD, shouldst mark iniquities, O LORD, who shall stand. But there *is forgiveness* with thee, that thou mayst be feared..... And he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities." Ps. cxxx, 3, 4, 8. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree: Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and *forgiveness of sins*. Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins*." Acts v, 30, 31, and xiii, 38. This then we believe, and all the Bible says about the forgiveness of sins; and whoever asserts to the contrary, grossly misrepresents us. We call upon Dr. Ely to sustain his assertion, or retract it forever.

We assert in substance, that "every sinner receives in this life the full penalty of his transgressions," and we do it on the authority of the Bible. It is therein said—"But he that doeth wrong *shall receive* for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." Col. iii, 25. "Behold, the righteous shall be *recompensed in the earth*: much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. xi, 31. Such is a portion of holy writ upon which we make the assertion; and we call upon the Dr. to acknowledge its truth, or explicitly deny the obvious sense of the above cited passages.

But the Dr. will still be in the dark, unless we can induce him to review his assertions, and observe that he entirely *confounds* sin with punishment. Let him know, then, that Universalists, who read the Bible, know, that sin and the penalty due to sin are widely different matters; and though the Bible teaches the forgiveness of *sins*, it no where even speaks of the forgiveness of deserved *punishment*. Dr., do you now understand us? S. W. F.

HISTORY.

History, as some one has it, is philosophy teaching by example. In this sense it becomes a didactic composition, instructing men by faithful pictures of the past, how the current of moral and physical events is affected by the ever varying causes, that regulates its motions. The historian selects certain features of his story about which he groups the rest, receding in perspective, as their importance in his own view demands. Unfortunately for man, war has ever occupied this front ground in history, whilst the arts of peace have been thrown back into the shade or entirely obscured by the false brilliancy with which military deeds have been set forth. Almost every historian has been guilty of this error. Overlooking the nobler attributes of man they have exalted his physical above his moral nature; they have dignified his animal powers of destroying his own species and rendering the earth a frightful desert, by holding them up before the eyes of men as worthy of the highest admiration. The warrior, who has slaughtered his brethren and robbed his neighbors of their lands, has been crowned with the chaplets of fame, whilst the conqueror of his own passions, who has spread out before the mind the vast fields of knowledge and thought, which his own faculties brought into existence, is passed by unnoticed. How small a place does Socrates occupy in the pages of history compared with the worthless exploits of Alexander! Even the sacred historians seem to have attached more importance to military glory than the peaceful spirit of the New Testament would allow.—Hence if we attempt to trace back the progressive developement of our moral and intellectual natures through the records of antiquity, we soon lose our way in the details of savage warfare.

"History is philosophy teaching by example," but what are her lessons, what is her influence upon the civil relations and moral duties of men? It may be said that by holding up to our view the horrors and calamities of war, she teaches us to avoid its miseries.

But history does not lay open the evils of war in their hateful deformity; it does not hold up the bloody dagger to the sight; nor display the long train of sorrow and suffering which follows in the footsteps of war. It rather casts a veil over these revolting pictures and by the pomp of triumph and the honors of victory fans the flame of ambition in the aspiring chieftain and urges him on to battle. The story of heroic deeds and noble daring is ever present to the imagination of the young, and revives the ardor of youth in the bosoms of the old. The death-like influence pervades the forms of civil government. Military power triumphs over legislative and judicial authority. History is the avenue through which this martial spirit creeps into the language and literature of a country. The splendid trappings; the sublime description; the magnanimous and patriotic ardor; the honor of victory, all embellished by the genius of the historian, are seized upon by the poet and endowed with an animated existence in his worlds of fancy, or embalmed by the moralist amongst the maxims of a virtuous life. Sculpture transmits the features of the hero to posterity, whilst painting exhibits on canvass the tales of history in the mimic beauty of real life. Even religion has introduced the technicalities of war and battle into her sacred dialect, and associated the attribute of the Prince of Peace with the blood stained banners of war and the implements of death. Whilst war is made the leading object of history; whilst its horrors and fiend like purposes are concealed under the tinsel glare of patriotism and glory; so long will it corrupt the moral feelings of society and mingle its savage features amongst the tenderest objects of our affections. Let the historian select the moral condition of man as the great object to which all else is subservient. Let him arrange every action and influence as they tend to exalt and purify our spiritual nature, or to reduce us to the level of brutal life. Let war be seen raising its bloody head amidst scenes of destruction and death. Let military glory be blotted out by the tears of widows and orphans. Let the field of battle speak from the canvass in the terrible language of reality. Let history portray the unholy passions and savage features of the warrior, whilst she stamps upon his character the impress of everlasting infamy. Then would her lessons be salutary, then might she assume the dignified name of philosophy, "The Pilot of life."—*Literary Gazette.*

In medicine, the chief tonics are bitter. The misfortunes of life are intended to act as such.—When a long series of prosperities have left the energies of our nature inactive—when the sun has shone so long and so brightly that we bask thanklessly in its beams, and with scarce a consciousness of its beauty—then comes on the lowering sky of the approaching tempest—then comes on sickness, the loss of friends, pecuniary losses, disappointed hopes, unexpected fears—and then it is that the dormant powers of our noble faculties are stimulated—our sympathies, our fortitude, our reliance on God.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1835.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

At the Orchard-st. Church. Subject for next Sabbath (to morrow) evening, *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.*—Matt. xii, 31, 32.

GREENWICH CHURCH.

On Sabbath afternoon, (to morrow, the 18th inst.) a Funeral Sermon will be delivered at the Greenwich Church, Sixth Avenue, foot of Amity-st. on the occasion of the death of Mrs. Darling.

In the evening the subject of the discourse will be from Hebrews ix, 27. "*And as it is appointed unto men once to die and after this the judgement.*"

BISHOP WARBURTON.

In the Modern History of Universalism, Bishop Warburton is mentioned as an intimate friend of Dr. Hartley, who is known to have been an avowed and able advocate of universal salvation. From this circumstance it may have been inferred that Bishop Warburton himself was not unfavorable to that sentiment. Such an inference we think might be fully justified by an examination of his works.—We therefore propose making a few extracts from his "Divine Legation of Moses," by which it will be seen in what estimation he held the doctrine of endless misery. He was arguing, as the extracts will show, that immortality is not to be considered a *reward* of human works.

"If reason," says he, "on the one hand seems to revolt at the thought of *everlasting punishment*; (for, as God is the rewarder of the good, we must conclude the apostle would have us infer that he is the *punisher* of the bad, since this exercise of his power over good and bad stands on the same attributes of goodness and justice;) If reason, I say, doth on the one hand seem to revolt at *everlasting punishment*, we must confess that FANCY, on the other, (even when full plumed by *Vanity*,) hath scarce force enough to rise to the idea of *infinite rewards*. How the heart of man came to conceive this to be an adequate retribution for his right conduct during the short trial of his virtue here, would be hard to tell, did we not know what monsters PRIDE begat of old upon *Pagan Philosophy*; and how much greater still these latter ages have disclosed by the long incubation of *School Divinity* upon *Folly*." B. ix, chap. 1.

In the following extract he speaks more clearly. He states and then refutes an argument introduced to support the hypothesis that immortality is the reward of virtue.

"'The merit of service, (say these men) increases in proportion to the excellence of that Being to whom our service is directed and becomes acceptable. An infinite Being, therefore, can dispense no rewards but what are infinite. And thus the virtuous man becomes entitled to immortality.'

The misfortune is that this reasoning holds equally on the side of the UNMERCIFUL DOCTORS as they are called, who doom the wicked to EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT. Indeed were this the only discredit under which it labors the *merciless Doctors* would hold themselves little concerned. But the truth is, the argument from infinity proves just nothing: to make it of any force, both parties should be infinite. This inferior emanation of God's *Image*, MAN, should be supremely good or supremely bad, a kind of Deity or Devil. But these reasoners in their attention to the Divinity, overlook the Humanity, which makes the decrease keep pace with the accumulation, till the rule of Logic that the *conclusion follows the weaker part*, comes in to end the dispute."—*Ibid.*

Bishop Warburton, we think, has shown too intimate an acquaintance with the *origin* and *history* of the doctrine of endless misery, to be himself a believer in it. He has proved, beyond all fair debate, that it is not taught, nor even intimated in the Old Testament scriptures, and at the same time, that it was publicly taught and popularly believed by almost the whole heathen world, and that too at a time when those blessed with a revelation from God were profoundly ignorant of every thing connected with it. It was not without meaning therefore that he called *Hell* an "orthodox consolation." S.

THE PHILADELPHIA DISCUSSION.

As every thing pertaining to this Discussion, will be received with great interest, by our readers generally, we have thought it best to present them with the following from the Philadelphian, (Dr. Ely's paper,) of Jan. 15th. The first article is a communication addressed the Dr., and his notice of it follows immediately, under the head of "Reply."

The Discussion.

Rev. and Dear Sir—Will you have the goodness to inform the readers of the Philadelphian, when it is expected that Mr. Ezra Stiles Ely and Mr. Abel C. Thomas, will finish their tedious and most unprofitable discussion?

It seems truly surprising that the editor of the Philadelphian should consent for a moment to waste his precious time in such a contest. No body really believes in the salvation of the finally impenitent; even the heathen themselves seem to know better than that.

Mr. Abel C. Thomas will find, ere long, that all his fine speculations will prove vain and delusive—that eternal life will not only prove a reality, but that *everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power*, will also prove a most awful reality to every one who rejects the gospel of Christ.

The above inquiry is respectfully made, with the hope that hereafter the productions of Mr. Abel C. Thomas will be found very scarce in the Philadelphian. S. S.

Reply.

Not a few differ in opinion from S. S. We lately received a letter from a judicious clergyman in the state of New-York, in which he says, "Your controversy with Mr. Thomas has been very gratifying to me, and to several others who read *the Philadelphian*. Are we to consider the whole matter at rest." This he wrote while I long ceased from the correspondence. "Mr. T.'s last letter is not yet answered, unless it be in No. 42 of your paper, which I have not received, and which I wish you would be good enough to send me. as I keep a file."

Mr. S. S. is informed, that some really believe the doctrine of universal salvation, and that multitudes wish to believe it, who ought to be guarded against that seductive system.

It has been an inducement to the editor to catch a moment whenever he can to prosecute the controversy, that many of the Universalist papers punctually reprint all our letters; and in this way probably not less than twelve thousand Universalists have read scriptural arguments against their *errors*, which otherwise would not have attracted their attention.

How long the discussion will be continued it is impossible now to say. I shall quit it when convinced that it is no longer desirable; and possibly from imperious circumstances sooner than I would wish.

S. S. may be comforted with this, however, that *my* letters shall in future be shorter than they have generally been. EDITOR.

Dr. Ely is right in affirming that "some really believe the doctrine of Universal Salvation," and we do not think he widely errs in supposing that "multitudes" *wish* it true—yea, might he not say the *whole christian* world? for it is beyond dispute the burden of their prayers and desires to God.—That they "ought to be guarded," however, "*against* that seductive system," is a matter upon which we should of course widely differ from the Doctor. We are much gratified, nevertheless, in witnessing the practical evidence he is giving of his desire to win us from our errors. Here has been the great failing of his prominent orthodox brethren. Have we asked them for an explanation of difficulties—for an examination of the subject in calmness and sobriety—they have turned away in disdain. What! discuss Universalism, occupy our "precious time" with that subject—why it is beneath our notice! And thus they have gone on, vainly flattering themselves, or endeavoring to lull their friends, into a feeling of security, with the idea that it was too insignificant to notice, until the denomination has arisen to a host, as it were—till its influence is exerted in every section of our widely extended country, through its 500 or 600 preachers, and particularly through its Periodicals, at least *thirty thousand* copies of which, are weekly proclaiming its doctrine to the community.

Dr. Ely has a sample of the spirit of which we are speaking, in his correspondent "S. S." Mr. "S. S." is very modest and unassuming, truly—he only "HOPES *that hereafter the productions of Mr. Abel C. Thomas will be found* VERY SCARCE *in the Philadelphian!*" No doubt. It has long been the policy. And his "*hopes*" would be *law*, had he the *power*. He would be glad, at the least, there is no question, to have Dr. Ely continue his, if he would but do it in the true Dr. Brownlee style; only let Mr. Thomas' be "*very scarce*"! But we are much gratified to find Dr. Ely an exception in this matter—to find him disposed to investigate the subject with such an unusual degree of candor for one in the orthodox ranks. We have felt at times, it is true, there was cause of complaint, even of him, but as a whole, thus far, we are under obligations to him for the respect and good feeling which *he* has manifested, when contrasted with the treatment we have usually received from those opposed to us. And we are ready, and willing, to hear all that he can offer as objections to our doctrine, so long as he preserves the unity of the spirit in the bonds of perfectness and peace. And why should we not? We can have no possible interest in maintaining error. The tenacity with which we might cling to it, would never make it truth. And the Dr. and every candid Partialist, (we do not use this word in reproach, but merely as a distinctive term,) must see and admit that we have an equal interest in understanding and *acknowleding* the *truth*, that they themselves have, and that they are no more justifiable in questioning our motives, than we are in questioning theirs.

In this view of the subject, the Dr. has adopted the true mode of procedure. He is willing to lay our arguments before his readers, and believing Universalism to be an error of great magnitude, he is *consistent* in promptly availing himself of the privilege afforded by our papers, of laying his arguments before Universalists. Whether the Universalists', or his own, are the "scriptural arguments," the various readers of them can best judge for themselves.

The Dr. says that probably not less than 12,000 Universalists have read his arguments. For his gratification and encouragement, we would inform him that those of our papers which are now promptly re-publishing the letters, do no circulate *less* than 13,000 to 14,000 copies weekly, and it is safe to calculate that each No. is read by 4 to 5 Universalists on an average, estimating old and young, and he has therefore the satisfaction of writing for, at least, *fifty to sixty thousand Universalists!*

But how is the state of the case with those of the other side? How happens it that not one solitary orthodox Journal from Maine to Georgia, save the "Philadelphian," has ever presumed to notice the Discussion? *Not one has ever hinted*, we believe, *that such a controversy existed!* The reader will make his own comments on this particular.

We hope the Dr. will find it both *desirable* and *convenient* to continue the discussion, until the subject is fully investigated. So far as this paper is concerned, we can assure him we shall cheerfully lend its aid in laying his observations before Universalists. If they have those "*errors*" of which he so emphatically speaks, the sooner they can be disvested of them the better.

The spirit in which Dr. Ely's correspondent writes, is any thing but *christian*, and would render him unworthy of serious notice, but for the respectable source through which he appears. We presume that Dr. E. knows him, and that he is a gentleman, but so blinded by bigotry that he knows not what manner of spirit he is of. One or two particulars in his communication we will just allude to. He deems it strange that the editor of the Philadelphian will waste his "precious" time in such a contest. If Dr. Ely's views are correct, and Universalism is that awful error which "S. S." himself regards it, is *any*, or *all time*, to "precious" for the Dr. to exert every faculty and power of his mind, in turning Universalists from the error of their ways, especially when such facilities are afforded him of speaking directly to Universalists? "S. S." says that "Mr. A. C. Thomas will find, ere long, that all his fine speculations will prove vain.

and delusive." Not if Mr. "S. S." was to have the ordering of affairs, for *he* would never put forth *one* effort to win A. C. T. from his "vain delusion"—*he* would never spend *his*," precious time," in such a work, but rather turn upon him with disdain, and deal out abuse, instead of kindness and compassion, upon the ignorant and those out of the way. No, no, for aught that Mr. "S. S." would do, A. C. T. and the whole body of Universalists might go down to the regions of everlasting pains.

"Nobody really believes, (says "S. S.") in the salvation of the *finally impenitent*." Would it not be well for 'S. S." to point to the scripture treating of the "finally impenitent," before he misleads the reader by an artful mode of expression? If he has ever read at all on the subject of Universalism, he is not justified in the least degree, in even insinuating that they advocate the salvation of the "*finally impenitent*." The very nature of their faith precludes such an idea. When he can show scripturally that there are, or will be, any "*finally* impenitent," of the human race, Universalists will yield the point. But they know no such teachings in the holy scriptures, and charity would dictate the enlightening of their minds on these points, through measures of kindness, before they are required blindly to acknowledge such an idea. They read, "As in Adam *all* die, *even* so IN Christ shall *all* be made alive!" And if any man be *in* Christ he is a new creature.

But we need not extend remarks. We really could *wish* that such a disposition as is manifested by "S. S." might be "very scarce" in a christian community. We are sure it would add much to the peace and harmony thereof. P.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of Jan. 13, 1835]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.—Letter 14.

Philadelphia, Jan. 15th, 1835.

Dear Sir,—The following remarks are intended as my reply to your letter of Jan. 3d.

Because at death *the spirit* of every man *shall return to God that gave it*, none can infer with any shadow of reason that every spirit will be happy in the immediate and sensible presence of its Maker. Its return to God after death does neither imply any incorporation into the essence of the Deity, as the Hindoos feign; nor any transformation of its nature or moral habits, or free exercises, which should render the immediate presence of God a source of delight. It has been, in my judgment, sufficiently evinced that the spirit returns to God to undergo a particular and personal adjudication either to endless life or endless death.

I have admitted, that after the resurrection of the bodies of the dead, the spirits of men that have died will be united to their risen bodies, and no longer exist in a separate state; so that in this sense *hades*, spoken of primarily as the state of separate human spirits will be no more. No other destruction of *hades* has been admitted by me; for the Scriptures clearly teach that beside *human*, there are *other*, spirits, in existence, in what we commonly call *the world of spirits*. Because there will be no more spirits of men in a state of separation from their bodies after the resurrection, and no more *a hades* in this sense, it will not follow that there is no *paradise* of God in which the whole complex persons of the saints, consisting of spirits united to glorified bodies, will be happy with God: nor will it hence appear, that there is no state of misery in which the whole complex persons of the immortal wicked ones will be equitably punished forever. You ask, if I can *conceive of endless punishment* in a *place that is to be destroyed:* and I answer, that *place* meaning position, point, or portion, in infinite space will never be destroyed. Infinite space is as indestructible as that God whom we could not conceive of as infinite, and omnipresent, without necessarily admitting such a thing as unbounded space.

While infinite space exists there can be no such destruction of *place* as will preclude a *state* of misery, or prevent any place from being hell where any being can be found who experiences unmingled misery and is assured of its perpetuity.

By regarding many expressions in a history as highly figurative we do not invalidate the truth of that history. In speaking of the battle of the Nile one might say, that Nelson's cannon *breathed* out flames and grape shot. Would it follow from this figure of *breathing* that there was no battle of the Nile? Just as unreasonable would it be to infer from the figurative expression of Abraham's *bosom* that Christ gave no true history of events with which he was acquainted.

Your whole argument, designed to show that the account of the rich man and Lazarus is a parable founded on this false principle, that if *one part*, or word of a history be used figuratively, the whole history must be deemed a parable. No principles of interpretation could be more absurd; for it would follow that if any figures of speech are used in the history of General Washington, then there was no real Washington, and no revolutionary war, but Washington's name was the symbol of some fancy, and the American revolution was but an emblem of some Don Quixotic recontre.

Every one will see the utter falacy of the inference, that if *Abraham's bosom* was an emblem of the society of that father of the faithful, then Lazarus must have been a figure, instead of a real beggar, and the rich man no man at all but a symbol of the Scribes and Pharisees.

Your whole attempts to disprove the statement that Christ gave a simple narrative of facts, of which he had knowledge rest on your assertion, that "If *one* part be emblematical, the whole must be interpreted parabolically."—This I deny.

Your strained, unnatural paraphrase of the whole account were it a parable, would be sufficient to discard your scheme which appears sufficiently ridiculous, without further remarks from your friend, EZRA STILES ELY.

I propose to defer my reply to the foregoing Letter until next week. My reason is simply this: I perceive that the Universalist papers in which the Controversy is published, find it difficult to arrange the Letters in their proper order. Confusion is the consequence. I desire that the discussion may clearly present the topics introduced to the reader's mind. Besides: were each of the parties to write a letter of greater length each alternate week, an equal amount of argument would be introduced. as is published weekly at present, and better justice could be done to the questions at issue. The next communication of the undersigned will, it is expected, be a reply to two of his opponent brother's essays. A. C. T.

[From the Philadelphian of Jan. 13, 1835.]

UNIVERSALISM RENOUNCED.

Mr. Russel Canfield called on me and stated, that some time since he had renounced the doctrine of Universal Salvation, after having advocated it for years, and that he was disposed publicly to state his reasons for such renunciation. He was a perfect stranger to me; whose name I did not then ask. He intimated that he could not well afford to hire a room for the delivery of his discourse; and being possessed in my own right of a Session Room, I gave him the privilege of using it for that purpose.

This Mr. A. C. Thomas calls joining hands with Infidels; because Mr. Canfield, it seems, has turned from Universalism to Atheism.

What opinions Mr. C. had adopted, until I saw "Presbyterianism and Infidelity" in the "Philadelphia Liberalist," was unknown to me. I would be willing, however, to hear any reasonable being state good reasons for thinking that the Bible contradicts the idea that all sinners, however they may live and die, will be happy forever.

On the evening of the 10th inst. Mr. C. gave his lecture, and stated some very good reasons for renouncing *Universalism*, and none for having adopted *a worse scheme of delusion*.

Some Universalists, a few Atheists, and more sound Calvinists attended the lecture. After he had concluded his argument, he replied to the publication of Mr. Thomas, that he had not informed me of his present sentiments, because he had not been interrogated by me concerning them;—that he could retort upon Mr. Thomas the charge of rejecting a large portion of the Bible;—that he did not believe in the God of Christianity;—that he did not acknowledge the authority of the Bible; that he does believe the Bible teaches the doctrine of endless misery;—that he had known some Universalists to be good, moral men;—that he generally found Universalism did not make men better;—and that in his judgment Universalism has a strong tendency to Infidelity and immorality.

One of the audience asked with apparent triumph who made the First Cause? So there were at least two Atheists present. Never before have we heard any one deny the being of his Maker!

Rejoinder.

The editor of the Philadelphian should have copied my article. If he is disposed to "do justly," he will insert it even at this late hour.

The charge of Mr. Canfield, namely, that I reject the greater portion of the Bible, or any part, is utterly false; and unless he speedily retracts it, I will take suitable steps to bring him to a sense of his duty.

The editor of the Philadelphian denies that he knew what Mr. Canfield's sentiments are. This in all likelihood is true, so far as granting the use of the Session Room is concerned—but Mr. Ely had the evidence in his pocket, that Mr. Canfield was an Infidel, several hours at least before the time appointed for the lecture.

I believe that Mr. Ely did not allow Mr. C. to proceed with the lecture because he loved Presbyterianism less, but because he hated Universalism more.

Mr. Canfield intimates that the Universalist clergy are immoral and dishonest men. I aver that this is a vile slander. I am sensible that the clergy of our denomination are fallible, and that some of them are "no better than they should be"—but this wholesale denunciating slang of Mr. C. is as false as it is contemptible.

I am allowed but little space for remark this week, and will therefore only add the following:

Partialists and Infidels unite in five particulars: 1st. They agree in the statement that the Bible teaches the doctrine of endless misery. 2d. They unite in the judgment that Universalism has a strong tendency to immorality. 3d. They agree in maintaining doctrines which, however dissimilar, are abominations in the sight of Universalists. 4th. They unite in the declaration that Universalism leads to Infidelity. 5th. They unite in their opposition to Universalism.

In addition to the foregoing, I observe, that Mr. C. *does not believe* that Universalism leads to Infidelity—for if he *did*, he would not oppose the doctrine. He knows full well that Universalists are the only persons who can successfully arrest the spread of Infidel principles; and hence his charges against us. He also knows that the undersigned commenced a Series of Lectures in proof of the Divine Existence and of the truth of Christianity a few weeks since; and hence his willingness to join with the Presbyterians in the warfare against "the faith once delivered to the saints."

In conclusion: I hereby certify whom it may concern, that I rejoice with exceeding great joy in knowledge of the fact, that the Partialists and the Infidels are both engaged in opposing Universalism. The Pharisees and Sadducees stand equally opposed to the salvation of all men. Although *their doctrines* are far from being "*lovely* in their lives," I sincerely hope they may be co-workers so long as they exist in the world, and that "in their *deaths* they may not be divided." When Partialism dies, Infidelity will be buried. Let all the people say Amen.

Given under my hand this 15th day of January, 1835.

ABEL C. THOMAS.

REV. JOHN REYNOLDS.

We perceive by a late No. of the "Impartialist" published at Claremont, N. H. that Br. Balch in noticing the remarks in this paper relative to Mr. Reynolds, has stated other circumstances, (relating, without any doubt, to the same individual,) which fully confirm our apprehensions of

his exceptionable course. Br. Balch gives an extract of a letter which he received from Mr. R. under date of "Bradford, N. H. June 2, 1834." In this letter Mr. R. states that he remained in the Methodist Church *four years*, and observes, "Though I united with the Methodists first it was not from any doubt of God's universal grace, but to prevent any reproach from falling on the Universalists, *by admitting me before I had formed a character*!" We marvel greatly that in his extreme solicitude for the reputation of Universalism, he should be so regardless of his own, as to play a double part with his Methodists friends for *four years*, to "*form a character*" before Universalists. He has sadly mistaken Universalism in supposing it could be satisfied with such proofs as this. It can no more countenance such a course towards others, than it can towards itself.

We may mention one circumstance more, named by Br. Balch, to show the great *imprudence* of Mr. R. speaking in the mildest terms possible. We give it in his own words: "The next account we had of him he went to Br. King of Portsmouth, called himself a Universalist, took part with him in his Sabbath services, &c. He asked the assistance of Br. K. for a location. He recommended him to a lay brother at Great Falls whom he saw and with whom he made an engagement to preach. The same evening, if we have been rightly informed, he went to a Methodist meeting and took part in the services, pretended to be with them in sentiment, &c. He did not fulfill his appointment, nor was he heard of by Br K. till he met him in Boston, at which time he was preaching to the Reformed Methodist Society. Br. K. asked an explanation of his conduct, when he declared himself a Universalist, and also that he was preaching Methodism. Br. K. severely rebuked him for such double dealing." Br. Balch says that he went to Bradford, N. H. about nine months since, as a Restorationist preacher, and preached there and in the vicinity for a time, till divisions occurred among the brethren, when Br. B. on being made acquainted with the fact, and questioned in regard to him, promptly cautioned the friends against him, being satisfied that "no lasting good could result from his course of procedure, either to himself or any one else."

Although the crowded state of our columns week before last, obliged us to curtail our comments, and to omit them entirely on some particulars, on Mr. R.'s letter to "A.C.T." and "P." yet we did not design to allude to the subject again. On the receipt of Br. Balch's statement, however, we felt that duty to ourselves required a notice of it. The reason is obvious. Mr. R. complains of ill-treatment, that a private explanation was not sought, &c. From the circumstances before us we could have no confidence in a *private* explanation, nor in him, unless he could clear himself from the suspicions in an open frank manner. We called for an explanation, with the statements connected. Those statements were good only so far as our declarations would go, and we might be supposed by some to have a bias of feeling, (which by the by we were not conscious of.) But the evidence furnished by Br. Balch, is entirely disinterested, so far as ourselves are concerned; and from it, with what we have before stated, the reader will judge for himself whether we have erred towards Mr. R. If we have, we sincerely regret it. P.

Original.

REV. MR. URMSTON.

Messrs. Editors—In the 9th No. of the present vol. Messenger and Universalist, is an article signed "J. B. N." in which the writer states, that the Rev. Mr. Urmston, a Presbyterian clergyman of Newtown, Conn. remarked (at a wedding) that there was a Universalist society in Danbury—but they were a set of "Red Noses."

After perusing the article, I called on Mr. Urmston and made inquiry respecting the statement. He replied that he *never said so*—that he did not know there was a Universalist society in Danbury. I remarked that the statement was made in a New-York paper, and if it was erroneous, the editors would give the name of the writer. He inquired whether it was in a Universalist paper, and on being answered in the affirmative, said that *he would not notice it.*

As the statement is contradicted, you will perceive there is a *lie* somewhere; and in justice I think your correspondent should inform the public on what his statement rests. At present it appears doubtful which of the two "have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone." A. C.

Danbury, Jan. 1835.

Remarks.

From the fact that Mr. U. will not notice the statement of "J. B. N." *because* it appeared in a Universalist paper, we conclude it cannot be very grievous to him, whether *true* or *false*.

So far as M. U. is concerned, (judging from the contempt manifested by him because the statement appeared in a Universalist paper,) we see not that our correspondent is specially called upon to notice the denial, but for the public satisfaction, it may be well, if he has farther particulars, to present them. It is really singular Mr. U. should be so ignorant of the existence of Universalists in Danbury, as we understand he has *resided* there within the past few years, and that he also *married his wife there*. But memory is sometimes treacherous, even with the best intentions.

We are wholly unacquainted with Mr. U. but are free to acknowledge that we are influenced to an unfavorable opinion of him, by his contemptuous conduct. If the least injustice, however, has been done him through the Messenger we shall promptly correct it, if allowed the opportunity. We had that acquaintance with, and confidence in, our correspondent, to believe that he would communicate nothing but what was well founded in fact. P.

MINISTRY AT LARGE.

We acknowledge the receipt of a 12mo. Pamphlet, of 24 pages, entitled "Mr. Arnold's third semi-annual Report of his services as Minister at large, in New-York. Published by the Book and Tract Society of the first Congregational Church." Our readers will remember that we made extensive extracts from the *second* semi-annual Report of Mr. A. in the order of its publication. We have had time only to merely glance at the one before us, but from this hasty view, we think it likely we shall favor our readers with extracts from this, also, at our earliest convenience. It is an important subject, and so far as we can judge, Mr. A. possesses a laudable zeal in a most interesting cause—the improvement of the intellectual and moral condition of the poor among us. We perceive no place is named in the Pamphlet where it can be obtained, to which we might refer the reader to procure it. We should think its general ciculation might do good. It embraces a somewhat extensive examination of the subject of pauperism and its remedy, which has occupied too little public attention. P.

*** Will Br. Skinner credit Wm. Peck, Danbury, Fairfield Co. Conn. $1 50 for present (6th) volume Magazine and Advocate, paid to me, and call on Mr. J. B. Marchisi, Utica, for the amount, and request him to place it to my account. P.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A letter from a friend and subscriber in Conecuh county, Alabama, states that they experience much opposition from limitarians in that region, the Methodists, Baptists, and other denominations having actively combined to put down Universalism. By their exertions they deter many from taking, and even reading, our periodicals. They *say* and *do* all they possibly can in opposition. This is *their* way. They will never, if in their power, allow a considerate examination of the subject. But our friends live in hope.—Our correspondent says that they are daily expecting a preacher from Ohio, and if he is a preacher indeed, he will do them good, otherwise harm. This last remark is an important truth, and they will do well to look to it thoroughly. Let them know fully *who* they employ as a teacher. A worthy individual will never hesitate to give ample testimonials of his standing in the connexion, or complain of being required to do it, or be unprepared for it. If friends would only use the ordinary caution here that they do in the general transactions of life we should avoid many unpleasant consequences. Daily experience is showing the necessity of an increased attention to this particular. As the denomination advances in numbers and popular favor, *pretenders* in the ministry, those who *preach* but *practice* not, will multiply. Let us, then, be prudent in our engagements.

Our correspondent says, "Rev. L. F. W. Andrews is laboring zealously and successfully I understand in some parts of this state and Georgia. He has promised to visit us in a short time. I have never seen him, but take his paper, and think him an able advocate of the doctrine. If we could get him to spend a part of his time with us I have no doubt the cause would soon begin to flourish rapidly."—The writer has not misjudged in regard to Br. Andrews.—He is an able and zealous minister of the Reconciliation, and we trust his labors will be abundantly prospered at the South. P.

LOMBARD-ST. CHURCH—Philadelphia.

On Sunday evening last, the undersigned stated his reasons for renouncing the doctrine of endless punishment. To morrow evening, 25th inst. he expects to deliver his third Lecture in confirmation of the truth of Christianity; and on the Sunday evening thereafter, he proposes to state his reasons for embracing the doctrine of Universalism.

A. C. T.

*** The Christmas sermon from Br. P. is received. We are compelled to delay its insertion for a week or two. The sudden suspension of navigation disappointed us in the receipt of a lot of paper, which was on its way, and we are therefore short of paper, and cannot let the type stand (from the extreme length of the sermon) any considerable time for the purpose he names. Our sheet is an unusual size in this market. We cannot match it well. As soon as the supply reaches us we will attend to the request.

Died,

In New-York, 12th of Jan. inst. Mrs. Betsey, relict of Thomas Darling, aged 58 years. The subject of this obituary had ten months since a stroke of the palsy which deprived her of the use of her left side. On the Thursday previous to her decease, without any premonitory symptoms, while sitting in her chair, she was attacked with another shock. She retained her senses only three or four minutes and remained unconscious to the time of her death.

Mrs. Darling had for many years been a firm believer in the doctrine of God's illimitable grace, and she found in view of a world's redemption a source of consolation which enabled her to bear with fortitude and resignation many severe trials to which she was called. In the various duties of life she exhibited an exemplary pattern, and the remembrance of her virtues will be long cherished by her surviving children and a large circle of acquaintances. The consolations of the Gospel were administered by the writer of this article. C. F. L. F.

In New-York on the 13th inst. Peter Marks, infant son of E. Wheaton, Esq. aged 1 year, 3 months and 13 days.

At his residence in Ridgefield, Conn. on the 13th inst. Mr. Timothy Hunt aged 64. Mr. H. was a member of the Universalist Society in North-Salem and was among the principal contributors in erecting the church in that place. He was a consistent advocate, both in theory, and in practice, for virtue and morality. And in justice to his character it may be said that he exemplified in his life the saying of the poet, "An honest man is the noblest work of God." A large circle of relations mourn his departure—the Universalist Society will feel the absence of a worthy member, and society at large will experience the loss of a valuable citizen. He died, as he lived, a believer in "the Gospel of Christ." S. J. H.

Religious Notices.

Br Hitchcock will preach in Newark the last Sabbath in Jan. (to morrow;) and first Sabbath in February, in this city, on exchange with Br. Le Fevre who will preach at Newark.

Br. Case will preach in Trumbull, Sunday Feb. 1, morning and afternoon, and at Bridgeport in the evening, and at Stratford on Monday evening, Feb. 2.

Br. Case will preach in Saugatuck, Feb. 15th.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Darien, near J. Whiting, Esq's. Saturday evening Jan. 24; at Flax Hill, Norwalk, in the morning, at the School house near Mr J. Mallory's in the afternoon, and at the brick school house near the Cotton Factory, on the Wilton road, in the evening of Sunday Jan 25; at Wilton Monday evening 26th, and in the school house near St. John's store, Tuesday evening 27th.

Br. N. Dodge will preach in Denbury the 1st Sabbath in Feb.; in Long-ridge the 2d Sabbath in Feb. and in North Salem, the 3d Sabbath in Feb.

Br. Asher Moore will preach in Westerly R. I. the *first* Sabbath—in New-London, Conn. the *second* and *fourth* Sabbaths, and in Norwich, Conn. the *third* Sabbath in each month, until further notice, commencing on the first Sabbath in Nov.

Br. Bulkely will preach at Annsville, or Peeks kill, 1st Sundry; in Milton the 3d Sunday, and in Collaburgh and Sing Sing, the 4th Sunday in each month for the year ensuing.

Adjourned Meeting.

The general meeting held at the Orchard-st church last Monday Evening, stands adjourned to to meet at the Greenwich Church, on MONDAY EVENING, (2d Feb.) at 7 o'clock. It is especially desired that every Universalist, (the ladies as well as gentlemen,) should be present, who can possibly make it convenient.

INSCRIPTION

For a Picture representing two Children looking at Birds feeding.

Lovely dwellers of the air,
Feed ye—feed ye—do not spare;
Feed ye, little things of light,
Feed ye, 'tis your natural right.

He, who made the heavens and earth,
He, whose word gave all things birth,
He, too, shaped *your* tiny forms,
Breathed the vital flame that warms,
Plumed you, gave you wings to fly
Tireless through the far blue sky,
Gave for homes the wide green wood,
And provides your daily food—
Thus a Father's care doth span
Little Birds and lordly Man.

Therefore feed ye, creatures bright,
Sure our presence need not fright—
Safe from us the slightest feather
Ruffling to the stirring weather—
Feed ye, and your strength recall,
Sacredly ye use it all—
For ye pour from tuneful throats
Streams of bliithe and grateful notes,
And a daily hymn do raise
To your bounteous Maker's praise—
Owning thus the guardian care,
That provides your daily fare.

Ye do teach us, little Birds,
Lessons weightier far than words—
Ye do tell us what we owe
For our blessings' ceaseless flow—
Ye do bid *our* thanks be given
For the daily gifts of Heaven.

Be your lessons pondered well,
Truth to man e'en birds may tell.

Christian Register.

THERE IS TIME ENOUGH.

This is one of the most mischievous sentences in the English Language. Not that it is bad in itself—for it is true, as we intend to show presently. But its meaning is sadly perverted, and what is meant for good becomes the occasion of evil.

Many a good thing might have been done had it been begun in season, but because there was time enough it was let alone, and let alone, and so not started till too late, or never moved at all.

But there is such a thing as bringing good out of evil. The bee extracts honey, as sweet, if not as abundant, from the thistle, as from the rose. And he who would profit by studying human nature, and watching divine providence may learn wisdom from his past errors, and turn even his misfortune to some good account.

The wisest man of ancient day, (and we believe he was fully as wise as people commonly are at present)—the wisest man of ancient days, has given us to understand that there is a time for every thing under the sun. A time for laughter and for tears, for sorrow and for joy. A time for business, a time for recreation, and a time for rest, but does not say a word about leisure time, or time for idleness. He speaks too of a time to die, leaving us to infer, as we may very naturally, that He, who made the sun to rule the day, the moon and the stars to govern the night, has given us time enough, just time enough, and none to spare, to perform all our duties, and enjoy every rational pleasure—to make the world better for our having lived in it—and to become better fitted ourselves, for "Another and a better world."

There is time enough, says the schoolboy—but his time runs out, and he goes half fitted, to the counting room, or enters, half fitted, at college.

Time enough, thinks many a young man, if he does not say so, to commence habits of frugality and economy, and thus provide for future wealth—but the time never, never comes—and he, to use a homely phrase of Dr. Franklin's, "scratches a poor man's head as long as he lives."

How many designs have we formed, of doing this and that good thing, which fell through, not because we had little time—but because we have time enough, and so wasted one hour after another till the time had passed.

Time enough to work, says the idler and spendthrift—but his clothes wear out before he finds time to earn new ones—and his pockets are emptied, and he has had no time to replenish them.

Franklin has a homely saying to this effect—that he who loses an hour in the morning, must run all day, and 'tis a wonder if he overtake his business before night. So, if any one find himself pinched for time, it is likely he has thrown away an hour, when he thought he had time enough and a little to spare.

Time enough—say we, when in a serious mood, we resolve to be more diligent, more systematic, more punctual—when we resolve upon any reform.

We do not mean to procrastinate—but while we muse, the moment passes, it is irrecoverably lost.

Do you say, we knew all this before.

No doubt of it. Yet we are apt to think there is not only time enough, but some to spare. But this is an error, and should be corrected.

The different lengths of different lives is nothing against our position, that life is just long enough. The oldest person has enough of duty and enough of pleasure too, if he lives aright, to occupy his three score years and ten—while he whose sun goes down at noon, has time enough, if he will but improve it, to make his life here a blessing to others, and that hereafter, blessed and glorious to himself.

——"That life alone is long,
Which answer's life's great end."

Portsmouth Journal.

THE LANGUAGE OF ANIMALS.

"That animals have each a language of their own to one another," says James Hogg, in his Sermons, "there can be no doubt. I know a good deal of their language myself. I know by the voice of the raven when he has discovered one of my flock dead—I know also his prelude to the storm and fine weather. The moorfowls can call one another from hill to hill. I learned to imitate their language so closely that I could have brought scores of them within the range of my shot of a morning. The black-cock has a call too, which brings all his motley mates around him, but the females have no call. They are a set of subordinate beings, like the wives of a nabob. They dare not even incubate upon the same hill with their haughty lords. But the partridge, and every mountain bird, have a language to each other, and though rather circumscribed, it is perfectly understood, and as Wordsworth says, "not to me unknown." Even the stupid and silly barn door hen, when the falcon appears, can, by one single alarm note make all her chickens hide in a moment. Every hen tells you when she has laid her egg; and, lest it should not be well enough heard or understood, the cock exerts the whole power of his lungs to divulge the important secret. The black faced ewe, on the approach of a fox or a dog, utters a whistle through the nostrils which alarms all her comrades, and immediately puts them upon the look out. Not one of them will take another bite until they discover whence the danger is approaching. If the dog be with a man, sundry of them utter a certain bleat, which I know well but cannot describe, and begin feeding again. If the dog is by himself, they are more afraid of him than any other animal, and you will then hear the whistle repeated through the whole glen.

"But the acuteness of the sheep's ear surpasses all things in nature that I know of. A ewe will distinguish her own lamb's bleat among a thousand all braying at the same time, and making a noise a thousand times louder than the singing of psalms, at a Cameronain sacrament in the fields, where thousands are congregated—and that is no joke either. Besides the distinguishment of voice is perfectly reciprocal between the ewe and lamb, who amid the deafening sound, run to meet one another. There are few things have ever amused me more than a sheep shearing, and then the sport continues the whole day. We put the flock into the fold, set out all the lambs to the hill, and then send the ewes to them as they are shorn. The moment that a lamb hears its dam's voice, it rushes from the crowd to meet her, but instead of finding the rough, well-clad, comfortable mama, which it left an hour, or a few hours ago, it meets a poor naked shriveling—a most deplorable-looking creature. It wheels about, and uttering a loud tremulous bleat of perfect despair flies from the frightful vision. The mother's voice arrests its flight—it returns—flies, and returns again, generally for ten or a dozen times before the reconciliation is fairly made up."

Universalist Books,

Which may be obtained of A. C. Thomas, 152 Chesnut-street Philadelphia.

Balfour's First Inquiry—being a faithful examination of all the passages in the Bible in which the word Hell occurs—$1.

Balfour's Second Inquiry—being an examination of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the devil, and the import of the words translated everlasting, eternal, forever, &c.—$1.

Balfour's Essays on the state of the dead, and inquiries into the meaning of the words judge, damn, condemn, and their derivatives—$1.

Balfour's Examination of Stuart's Exegetical Essays—75cts.

Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart—25 cts. In this work the author has shown that his conversion to Universalism is mainly attributable to the Professor's criticisms on portions of the Bible.

Balfour's Letter in Reply to Dr. Allen's Lecture against Universal Salvation—25 cts.

Balfour's Letter to Whitman in defence of so much of the First Inquiry as pertains to the term Gehenna—25 cts.

Ballou's Treatise on Atonement—an invaluable work, being an inquiry into the origin, nature and effects of sin, and of the consequences of the Atonement—50 cts.

Ballou's Notes in illustration of the Parables—75 cts.

Ballou's XXVI Lectures on important doctrines—$1.

Ballou's XXV Select Sermons on various subjects—$1.

Ballou's XI Sermons delivered in Philadelphia—37 cts.

Ballou's Examination of the doctrine of future Punishishment—50 cts.

Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d.—$1.

Modern History of Universalism, by T. Whittemore—$1.

T. Southwood Smith's Treatise on the Divine Government—a work I would not be without for five times the price—75 cts.

Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, by Thomas Whittemore—an admirable and very useful volume—75 cts.

Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators, showing that the most eminent Partialist critics justify the Universalist's interpretations of nearly every prominent passage in the New Testament—$1.

Life of John Murray—Whittemore's much improved edition, 50 cts.—do. Marsh, Capen and Lyon's, 46 cts—also an edition at 37 cts.

Winchester's Dialogues on Universal Restoration—63 cts.

R. Streeter's Familiar Conversations on the doctrine and tendency of Universalism—a fine work—50 cts.

Streeter's News from Three Worlds—25 cts.

Universalist Expositor—critical and explanatory—3 volumes $2, 50 each.

Dolphus Skinner's Letters to Drs. Aikin and Lansing—50 cts.

Eternal Hell Torments Overthrown—37 cts.

Pitt Morse's Review of Parker's Lectures against the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

David Pickering's Lectures in proof of Divine Revelation—a subject to which Christians do not sufficiently attend—75 cts.

Letters on Revelation between Ballou and Kneeland—50 cts.

Streeter's New Universalist Hymn Book—50 cts.

Discussion at Danvers between Whittemore and Branson—25 cts.

Christian Visitant—a very useful and interesting work, in two volumes—25 cts. each.

Reply to Hawes' Reasons for not embracing Universalism—13 cts.

Christian Messenger, vols. I and II bound—$4 for the set.

Christian Messenger, vol. III bound—$2,50.

Most of the above Books are for Sale, Wholesale and Retail, at No. 2 Chatham-Square, foot of Bowery, New-York.

The Prize Tale.

We have just published at this office, in Pamphlet form, the Prize Tale inserted in No. 1 of this vol. $2,50 per 100, $7 1-2 cents per doz. Orders solicited.